Synthetic versus Dirac monopoles

Carl M. Bender[1], Maarten DeKieviet[2], and K. A. Milton[3]
[1]*Department of Physics, Washington University, St. Louis, MO 63130, USA*
[2]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Heidelberg University, INF 226, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany*
[3]*Homer L. Dodge Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019, USA*
(Dated: August 19, 2014)

In some recent experiments the distinction between synthetic magnetic monopoles and Dirac monopoles has been blurred. A case in point is the work in a letter by Ray *et al.* in which a beautiful experiment is reported but claims with regard to Dirac monopoles are misleading.

arXiv:1408.4051v1 [hep-th] 18 Aug 2014

A recent letter by Ray *et al.* [1] reports a nice experiment in which from measured projected number densities the authors deduce what they call a "synthetic magnetic field." However, nothing in the experiment implies the quantization of charge and thus the letter has no bearing on the Dirac monopole. The wording in this letter is misleading; from a casual reading of the letter one might come to the conclusion that the authors have actually found experimental evidence for a Dirac monopole. In fact, the reported experiment bears no serious relation to Dirac magnetic monopoles, whose necessary attributes are described in detail in Ref. [2]. There is no essential gauge freedom, no charge quantization, and no invisible Dirac string. A Dirac string is a pure gauge phenomenon and its spatial location can be changed by a gauge transformation. Its location cannot be observed in any experiment. In contrast, in the reported experiment there is a very visible vortex line, which is a topological singularity in the sense that encircling it is associated with a phase of 2π. The interpretation of this phase is simply that it a Berry phase, as discussed in detail nearly 30 years ago [3]. The term *Berry phase* is not mentioned anywhere in the letter.

The physical observables discussed in the letter are the superfluid velocity $\mathbf{v}_s$ and the vorticity $\mathbf{\Omega} = \boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \mathbf{v}_s$. Dropping the primes used in the letter, the explicit forms for these quantities for a vortex line starting at the origin and extending along the z axis are

$$\mathbf{v}_s = \frac{\hbar}{Mr} \cot\frac{\theta}{2}\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}, \quad \mathbf{\Omega} = -\frac{\hbar}{M}\left[\frac{\hat{\mathbf{r}}}{r^2} - \mathbf{f}^*(\mathbf{r})\right]. \tag{1}$$

Here the vortex line is described by

$$\mathbf{f}^*(\mathbf{r}) = 4\pi\delta(x)\delta(y)\theta(z)\hat{\mathbf{z}}. \tag{2}$$

Because $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\mathbf{f}^* = 4\pi\delta(\mathbf{r})$, it is indeed true that $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\mathbf{\Omega} = 0$. The content of the theoretical analysis of the letter now seems to be the statement that

$$\mathbf{\Omega} = -\frac{\hbar}{M}(\mathbf{B}^* - \mathbf{f}^*), \quad \boldsymbol{\nabla}\times\mathbf{v}_s = -\frac{\hbar}{M}\boldsymbol{\nabla}\times\mathbf{A}^*, \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{B}^* = \hat{\mathbf{r}}/r^2$, or that

$$\mathbf{B}^* = \boldsymbol{\nabla}\times\mathbf{A}^* + \mathbf{f}^*. \tag{4}$$

This indeed looks like the well-known equation relating the magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$ of a unit point magnetic monopole at the origin to the gauge potential $\mathbf{A}$ and the associated singular string function $\mathbf{f}$ [2]. However, this appearance is only formal. We can perform gauge transformations on $\mathbf{A}^*$ but we cannot change $\mathbf{f}^*$ because it refers to the location of the superfluid vortex line.

The transformations made in the supplementary information (19)–(21) of Ref. [1] are not permissible without changing the string function: *The magnetic field of a magnetic monopole is not simply the curl of a vector potential.* Since the "string" $\mathbf{f}^*$ here is a physical vortex line, such a transformation is impossible. Because

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) = \boldsymbol{\nabla}\lambda(\mathbf{r}) - \frac{1}{4\pi}\int (d\mathbf{r}')\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')\times\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}'), \quad \lambda(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int (d\mathbf{r}')\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}')\cdot\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}'), \tag{5}$$

$\mathbf{A}$ is determined (up to a gradient) by specifying $\mathbf{f}$; thus, with $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{f}^*$ in (2), the form for the vector potential given by (1) does not possess any essential gauge freedom. That is, a transformation $\mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{A} + \boldsymbol{\nabla}\lambda$ is permitted, but the string cannot be rotated. In particular, the curl of the singular vector potential $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ given in the letter's supplemental

information (19) cannot be equal to $\mathbf{B}^*$, because if it were, even in the distributional sense, then we would obtain the result

$$\int_S d\mathbf{S} \cdot \mathbf{B}^* = \oint_{\partial S} d\mathbf{r} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{r}). \tag{6}$$

This equation cannot be true because if the surface S were a boundary-free spherical surface about the origin, the right side would be 4π while the left side would vanish. Even if it were true that $\mathbf{B}^* = \boldsymbol{\nabla} \times \tilde{\mathbf{A}}$, the physical vortex line $\mathbf{f}^*$ in (4) would still remain. Another reason why it is not true is that there is an additional singularity, apparently unrecognized by the authors of Ref. [1], which arises because the vector potential must be a single-valued function. The string singularity is a necessary attribute of a Dirac monopole, and no gauge transformation can "annihilate" it.

Moreover, a Dirac magnetic monopole is physically realizable in quantum mechanics only because of the Dirac quantization condition between electric and magnetic charge e and g, $eg = n\hbar c$ (unrationalized units), where n is an integer or an integer plus one-half. (It is precisely this condition that makes the Dirac string invisible.) No analog of either electric or magnetic charge appears in the analysis in the letter.

The work of CMB is supported in part by the US Department of Energy and that of KAM by the Simons Foundation and the CNRS. KAM thanks Steve Fulling for discussions.

[1] Ray, M. W., Ruokokoski, E., Kandel, S., Möttönen, M., and Hall, D. S. Observation of Dirac monopoles in a synthetic magnetic field. Nature **505**, 657–660 (2014).
[2] Milton, K. A. Theoretical and experimental status of magnetic monopoles. Rep. Prog. Phys. **69**, 1637–1711 (2006).
[3] M. Stone, Born-Oppenheimer approximation and the origin of Wess-Zumino terms: Some quantum-mechanical examples. Phys. Rev. D **33**, 1191–1194 (1986).